

REMARKS

Please cancel Claims 2-3, 11 and 17 without prejudice. Claims 1, 4, 6-10, 12, 14-15, 18 and 20-23 are pending. Claims 1, 9 and 15 are amended herein. No new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments.

103 Rejections

According to the instant Office Action, Claims 1, 4, 6-10, 12, 14-15, 18 and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurita (U.S. Patent No. 6,073,260) in view of Sumita et al. ("Sumita;" U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0004888). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 4, 6-10, 12, 14-15, 18 and 20-23 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Kurita and Sumita, alone or in combination.

Applicants agree with the statement on page 3 of the instant Office Action to the effect that Kurita does not disclose selecting a signal depending on whether the signal selector detects power in a power rail. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Kurita also does not show or suggest "a signal selector ... for selecting between an output signal that is output from said first device and a bypass signal that has bypassed said first device; ... wherein said signal selector selects said output signal when said first device is powered on and said bypass signal when said first device is not powered on;" "selecting an output signal instead of said bypass signal, said output signal being output from said first device, wherein said output signal is selected when power is detected in a first power rail coupled to said first device and wherein said bypass signal is selected when no power is detected in said first power rail;" or "a bypass line

coupled to said input line upstream of said first device and to said signal selector such that said input signal is delivered to said signal selector even if said first device is powered off, wherein said signal selector selects between a signal on said output line and a signal on said bypass line, wherein said signal on said output line is selected when power is detected in said first power rail and said signal on said bypass line is selected when no power is detected in said first power rail” as recited in independent Claims 1, 9 and 15, respectively (emphases added).

Applicants respectfully submit that Sumita does not overcome the shortcomings of Kurita. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Sumita, alone or in combination with Kurita, does not show or suggest the limitations of independent Claims 1, 9 and 15 cited above. Kurita appears only to teach a non-zero intermediate voltage V_M that lies between a supply voltage V_{DD} and a ground voltage V_{SS} . A voltage determining circuit 19 is used to determine whether the level of the intermediate voltage V_M is desirable and “whether or not a signal is not output from the voltage generating circuit 17” (please refer to paragraphs 0051 and 0060 of Kurita, for example). Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Kurita, alone or in combination with Sumita, does not show or suggest selecting a signal depending on whether or not a device is powered on/off or whether or not power is detected in a power rail.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Kurita and Sumita, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the embodiments of the present claimed invention recited in independent Claims 1, 9 and 15 and that these claims are in condition for allowance. Because Claims 4, 6-8, 10, 12, 14, 18 and

20-23 depend from Claim 1, 9 or 15 and recite additional limitations, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 4, 6-8, 10, 12, 14, 18 and 20-23 are also in condition for allowance. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for rejecting Claims 1, 4, 6-10, 12, 14-15, 18 and 20-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims.


Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1, 4, 6-10, 12, 14-15, 18 and 20-23 overcome the rejections of record, and Applicants therefore respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 1/3/07



John P. Wagner, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,398

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060